

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of May 17, 2006, has been reviewed, and in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended, claims 2-11 and 13-25 are cancelled, and claims 26-38 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Change of Correspondence Address

A revocation and appointment of new power of attorney was filed on February 27, 2006 with the previous Response. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment of this submission. In addition, Applicants requested that the correspondence address be changed to reflect the address of the new power of attorney associated with Customer No. 21967. Applicants' agent hereby submits a change of correspondence address for this purpose.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 18 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants submit that the claims as amended overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The claimed subject matter is fully disclosed and supported by the specification as originally filed. More specifically, an embodiment of the claimed invention is described in Figure 3 and the corresponding description thereof. The claims have been amended to clarify various embodiments of the present invention. It is believed that the amendments and newly

added claims clearly define an embodiment of the claimed invention that is fully supported by the specification as originally filed.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/064,118. Applicants believe that the claims as amended do not constitute a double patenting rejection as the claims are not claiming common subject matter. However, upon an indication of allowable subject matter in the instant application, Applicants will promptly file a terminal disclaimer as the two applications are assigned to a common assignee.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ballard (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,765 B1). For at least the reasons detailed below, Applicants respectfully disagree. Ballard fails to disclose each and every limitations as recited by the amended claims and the new claims. Specifically, Ballard fails to disclose the limitations directed to “receiving a connection request from a client at a server, wherein the connection request comprises a request to a link;” “determining in response to the connection request whether a token has been received by the client from the server;” “wherein the token is created responsive to an earlier request from the client to the server;” “if the token has been received by the client, the method further comprises making an entry in a record to indicate that the token was received by the client and sending the requested link without the token, from the server to the client;” “wherein if the token has not been received by the client within a predetermined amount of time after receiving the

connection request, the method further comprises: determining whether the token has been prepared and is awaiting transmission to the client; processing the token with the requested link and sending the requested link with the token from the server to the client if the token has been retrieved within the predetermined amount of time after receiving the connection request, wherein the token serves to authenticate or authorize one or more subsequent resource requests by the client.”

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Patent Office bears the burden of presenting at least a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Anticipation requires that a prior art reference disclose, either expressly or under the principles of inherency, each and every element of the claimed invention. In addition, the prior art reference must sufficiently describe the claimed invention so as to have placed the public in possession of it. In this case, as discussed in detail above, the Office Action has failed to show that Ballard reference discloses each and every claim limitation recited by Applicants. Therefore, the Office Action has failed to meet its burden. The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn and the claims allowed accordingly.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

By:


Yisun Song
Registration No 44,487

Dated: August 2, 2006

Hunton & Williams LLP
Intellectual Property Department
1900 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006-1109
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)